

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The replacement sheets in the Appendix include changes to Figures 1-19. In each of the replacement drawing sheets, the respective drawing has been clarified by adding element lines, enlarging the numbers, removing solid shading, and by removing random lines. The drawings have not been substantively changed.

**Remarks**

The previously pending claims have been replaced with new claims that correspond to allowed claims in the corresponding European application. The European claims have been recast in a form more suited to U.S. practice without substantively changing their limitations. The new claims are consistent with the originally presented claims and consideration and allowance of the new claims are respectfully requested.

The previously filed drawings have been replaced with new drawings that are responsive to the criticisms in the Official Action. The suction cups are shown in Figure 6, as indicated in paragraph 0051 of the published application. The "piston-cylinder system" referred to well-known systems having springs in pistons. Since new claim 25 includes springs, the further reference to the piston-cylinder system has not been included in the new claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the drawings are respectfully requested.

The specification and Figures 1 and 2 have been amended to clarify identification of the elastic means. Figure 4 has been identified as prior art.

The Official Action rejects claim 4 under §112, first paragraph. This claim has been rewritten bearing this criticism in mind and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, and 9 were rejected under §112, second paragraph. The new claims have been drafted bearing these criticisms in mind. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13, and 20-21 were rejected as unpatentable over HAWES 3,392,467 in view of MUDRYK et al. 6,267,529. Claims 6 and 19 were rejected further in view of ORLANDO 3,148,856. The new claims avoid these rejections and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

The combination of HAWES and MUDRYK et al. does not disclose that in the device with the elastic means between the support arm and the fastening means as claimed, the elastic means are in a plane different from a plane of the panel and are arranged so that when the fluid exerts thrust on the panel, at least one of the elastic means undergoes a compression and at least one of the elastic means undergoes an extension.

That is, HAWES describes a device where the support assembly is fixed to a vehicle on the edges of the roof by retainer means 16 that includes a pair of hooks and springs 48 that are provided to avoid excessive tilting of the panel. As is apparent from Figure 2, the springs of each pair are independent and their extremities proximal to the panel are independently hooked on a hook

50. Consequently, as the panel tilts, one spring might be under traction, but the other spring of the same pair is not under compression because the latter is "loose." Further, the springs are not arranged as claimed; that is, the springs are not interposed between the distal end of the arm and the means for fastening on the roof. HAWES discloses that the springs are interposed between the panel and the hooks, but not between the connector plate 32 and the hooks 38 and/or the cups 36.

MUDRYK et al. do not make up for this shortcoming. There is but a single spring connection and no suggestion to arrange the springs on opposite sides, connected as claimed, so that one spring is under compression and the other under tension to maintain the initial position of the panel as claimed. The reference refers to a single flexible post in two parts comprising an intermediate spring 3 between the lower part 4 and the upper part 3. ORLANDO has similar shortcomings and does not make up for failings of HAWES.

Accordingly, the new claims avoid the rejections under §103.

The Official Action mentions, but does not rely on, BRECHT 5,207,377. This reference discloses several posts 116, each associated with a spring bellows 110 interposed between a mailbox and the respective post 116. The

several springs and arm do not participate in fixing the mailbox on the ground due to the arrangements illustrated in the drawings, namely the anchoring means cooperating with the ground including the post and its fixing by concrete. The artisan would not learn from this reference how to make up for the shortcomings of the above-discussed combinations.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future submissions, to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Thomas. W. Perkins/  
Thomas W. Perkins, Reg. No. 33,027  
Customer No. 00466  
209 Madison Street, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

TWP/jr

**APPENDIX:**

The Appendix includes the following items:

- 12 replacement drawing sheets.